CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Claudia Johnson ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, alleges on personal knowledge, investigation of counsel, and on information and belief as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION AND NATURE OF ACTION

- 1. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action for statutory damages, injunctive relief and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of Wells Fargo Dealer Services, Inc. ("Defendant"), formerly Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., in negligently and/or willfully placing or having calls placed to Plaintiff on her cellular telephone without her prior express consent and not for emergency purposes (sometimes referred to herein as "Prohibited Calls"), in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., ("TCPA").
- 2. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA in an effort to combat the invasion of privacy faced by everyday Americans who received unwanted calls. In relevant part, the TCPA prohibits the use of an automatic telephone dialing system to call any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service absent an emergency purpose or the "prior express consent" of the called party. The Federal Communication Commission ("FCC"), the agency empowered to implement the TCPA, mandates that "the burden will be on the creditor to show it obtained the necessary prior express consent."

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Court has jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because Plaintiff seeks up to \$1,500 in statutory damages for each of the hundreds of calls that were placed to her cellular phone in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed classes exceeds \$5,000,000.

Additionally, Plaintiff is a citizen of Texas and Defendant is a citizen of California.

In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 23 F.C.C.R. 559, at ¶ 10 (2008).

Plaintiff also seeks to represent numerous class members, who are citizens of various other States.

4. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant is a California corporation and, therefore, resides in California.

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, an individual citizen of the State of Texas, and resident of Tarrant County. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(32).
- 6. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a national automobile consumer lender and a California corporation. Defendant's principal place of business is 23 Pasteur, Irvine, California 92613. Defendant does business throughout the country, including this District. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a "person," as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(32).
- 7. Defendant is the successor to Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., a subsidiary of Wachovia Corporation. Wachovia Corporation, the parent corporation of Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., merged with Defendant's parent company (Wells Fargo & Company) pursuant to a definitive merger agreement, which closed on December 31, 2008. Subsequent to the closing of the merger, Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc. changed its name to Wells Fargo Dealer Services, Inc. Defendant is the continuation of Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., occupies the same offices, including 23 Pasteur, Irvine, California 92613 and employs substantially similar debt collection practices previously employed by Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., including use of automatic telephone dialing systems. As its successor, Defendant is liable for all actions of Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc. and the term "Defendant" encompasses both Wells Fargo Dealer Services, Inc. and Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc.

# PLAINTIFF'S FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

2.0

- 8. Defendant has placed numerous Prohibited Calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone. The FCC has mandated: "[a] creditor on whose behalf an autodialed or prerecorded message call is made to a wireless number bears the responsibility for any violation of the Commission's rules. Calls placed by a third party collector on behalf of that creditor are treated as if the creditor itself placed the call." Thus, Defendant is liable for the Prohibited Calls placed by any third party seeking debt collection for Defendant's accounts. Additionally, Defendant is liable for Prohibited Calls it has placed directly.
- 9. These Prohibited Calls were placed by Defendant starting in approximately early 2010 and continued thereafter.
- 10. During these Prohibited Calls, Defendant used an "automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial or prerecorded voice" as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). Some of these Prohibited Calls played a prerecorded message. Other calls had a delay prior to a live person speaking to Plaintiff, indicating that the calls were placed by an automatic telephone dialing system.
- 11. These calls were for the purpose of collecting debt and were not for emergency purposes.
  - 12. Plaintiff has incurred charges for these Prohibited Calls.<sup>3</sup>
- 13. Plaintiff does not have any loans with Defendant and the Prohibited Calls are being placed for a loan owed by Plaintiff's husband.
- 14. Plaintiff did <u>not</u> co-sign or guarantee her husband's loan in any manner whatsoever. Plaintiff has not provided her cellular phone number to Defendant or signed any paper work relating to her husband's loan.
- 15. Defendant obtained Plaintiff's cellular phone number because she was listed as a reference for her husband's loan or through the skip-tracing process used

The FCC has made clear that "wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used." Id. ¶ 7.

by debt collectors to independently locate telephone numbers of debtors' family members.

- 16. Plaintiff did not provide "prior express consent" to receive the Prohibited Calls on her cellular telephone as set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 17. These Prohibited Calls placed by Defendant were in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Consent Class"), as follows:

All persons within the United States to whom Defendant(s) has placed a call to said person's cellular telephone (without their prior express consent and not for emergency purposes) through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

19. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Reference Class"), as follows:

All persons within the United States to whom Defendant has placed a call to said person's cellular telephone through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, where such person does not have any debtorcreditor relationship with the Defendant (i.e., the recipient of Defendant's call is a reference, family member of the debtor or the like).

20. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Skip-Tracing Class"), as follows:

All persons within the United States to whom Defendant has placed a call to said person's cellular telephone through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, where such person's cellular phone number was obtained by Defendant through skip tracing (i.e., Defendant independently obtained the cellular phone number from sources other than the called party or the creditor).

- 21. Defendant, its employees and other agents, the Judge to whom this action is assigned and any members of the Judge's staff, and claims for personal injury, wrongful death and/or emotional distress are excluded from the classes. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the definitions of the classes as facts are learned through further investigation and discovery.
- 22. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Consent Class, Reference Class and Skip-Tracing Class (together, the "Classes") but believes, based on Defendant's market share and investigation of counsel, that the number is in the thousands, if not substantially higher for each of the Classes. Thus, joinder of all members of each class is impractical due to the size of each class and relatively small value of each member's claim.
- 23. The Internet is replete with discussions between numerous members of the Classes desperate to end Defendant's Prohibited Calls. The following is a sampling, evidencing Defendant's egregious violations of the TCPA, the invasion of privacy suffered by members of the Classes, the numerosity of the Classes' members, the commonality of the issues and the typicality of Plaintiff as a representative for the Classes:

PLAINTIFF'S FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. Defendant has placed numerous Prohibited Calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone. The FCC has mandated: "[a] creditor on whose behalf an autodialed or prerecorded message call is made to a wireless number bears the responsibility for any violation of the Commission's rules. Calls placed by a third party collector on behalf of that creditor are treated as if the creditor itself placed the call." Thus, Defendant is liable for the Prohibited Calls placed by any third party seeking debt collection for Defendant's accounts. Additionally, Defendant is liable for Prohibited Calls it has placed directly:
- 9. These Prohibited Calls were placed by Defendant starting in approximately early 2010 and continued thereafter.
- 10. During these Prohibited Calls, Defendant used an "automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial or prerecorded voice" as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). Some of these Prohibited Calls played a prerecorded message. Other calls had a delay prior to a live person speaking to Plaintiff, indicating that the calls were placed by an automatic telephone dialing system.
- 11. These calls were for the purpose of collecting debt and were not for emergency purposes.
  - 12. Plaintiff has incurred charges for these Prohibited Calls.<sup>3</sup>
- 13. Plaintiff does not have any loans with Defendant and the Prohibited Calls are being placed for a loan owed by Plaintiff's husband.
- 14. Plaintiff did <u>not</u> co-sign or guarantee her husband's loan in any manner whatsoever. Plaintiff has not provided her cellular phone number to Defendant or signed any paper work relating to her husband's loan.
- 15. Defendant obtained Plaintiff's cellular phone number because she was listed as a reference for her husband's loan or through the skip-tracing process used

The FCC has made clear that "wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used." <u>Id.</u> ¶ 7.

by debt collectors to independently locate telephone numbers of debtors' family members.

- 16. Plaintiff did not provide "prior express consent" to receive the Prohibited Calls on her cellular telephone as set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 17. These Prohibited Calls placed by Defendant were in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Consent Class"), as follows:

All persons within the United States to whom Defendant(s) has placed a call to said person's cellular telephone (without their prior express consent and not for emergency purposes) through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

19. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Reference Class"), as follows:

All persons within the United States to whom Defendant has placed a call to said person's cellular telephone through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, where such person does not have any debtorcreditor relationship with the Defendant (i.e., the recipient of Defendant's call is a reference, family member of the debtor or the like).

20. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Skip-Tracing Class"), as follows:

All persons within the United States to whom Defendant has placed a call to said person's cellular telephone through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, where such person's cellular phone number was obtained by Defendant through skip tracing (i.e., Defendant independently obtained the cellular phone number from sources other than the called party or the creditor).

- 21. Defendant, its employees and other agents, the Judge to whom this action is assigned and any members of the Judge's staff, and claims for personal injury, wrongful death and/or emotional distress are excluded from the classes. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the definitions of the classes as facts are learned through further investigation and discovery.
- 22. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Consent Class, Reference Class and Skip-Tracing Class (together, the "Classes") but believes, based on Defendant's market share and investigation of counsel, that the number is in the thousands, if not substantially higher for each of the Classes. Thus, joinder of all members of each class is impractical due to the size of each class and relatively small value of each member's claim.
- 23. The Internet is replete with discussions between numerous members of the Classes desperate to end Defendant's Prohibited Calls. The following is a sampling, evidencing Defendant's egregious violations of the TCPA, the invasion of privacy suffered by members of the Classes, the numerosity of the Classes' members, the commonality of the issues and the typicality of Plaintiff as a representative for the Classes:

11	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1	"Beth	
2	9 Nov 2010	
3	Wells Fargo Dealer Services calls incessantly. I was listed as a reference for	
4	someone."	i
5	Available at, http://800notes.com/Phone.aspx/1-800-289-8004/7 (accessed on	
6	April 25, 2011).	
7	"Bob	
8	4 Mar 2011	
9	Have asked this company several times to stop calling me and they keep	
10	calling. I never had an account with them. There should be a way to file	
11	harrassment charges against them."	
12	Available at, http://800notes.com/Phone.aspx/1-800-289-8004/7 (accessed on	
13	April 25, 2011).	
14	"tired	
15	11 Mar 2011	
16	Tired of these phone calls. I have no dealings with WFS financial or	
17	Wachovia Dealer Services."	
18	Available at, http://800notes.com/Phone.aspx/1-800-289-8004/7 (accessed on	
19	April 25, 2011).	
20	"lori	
21	11 Nov 2009	
22	these [expletive] call me telling me that wendy dejo had me as a reference	
23	me and my husband ask me to for my info and account with i have no	
24	account with then, i have bank account with wachovia but not then, i hav	e
25	no idea who WENDY DEJO is. this is a scan."	
26	Available at, http://whocallsme.com/Phone-Number.aspx/8002898004 (accessed	
27	on April 25, 2011).	
28	3	

"g 1 8 Jun 2010 2 they just called me and left a message. a woman asking for gloria, saying 3 rodrigo gave her the number. no clue who those people are. everyone's 4 saying its wachovia..probably is, but i dont have any business with 5 wachovia either." 6 Available at, http://whocallsme.com/Phone-Number.aspx/8002898004) (accessed on April 25, 2011). 8 "Sara 9 19 Oct 2010 10 I got a call from this number as well. They were trying to contact my 11 Nanny from the summer who probably used me as a work reference when 12 purchasing her car. The man was very vague in what he wanted but wanted 13 me to tell him how to get in contact with her. I told him that I had not 14 spoken to her in months and that I was not sure how to get in touch with her 15 but that it was my cell number he was calling. This was also Wachovia 16 when I returned the call to see where they were calling from." 17 Available at, http://800notes.com/Phone.aspx/1-913-905-6404 (accessed on April 18 25, 2011). 19 "Erick 20 18 Oct 2007 21 Didn't pick up, left an automated message. I didn't get the first part of the 22 message, it starts with them saying their office hours and then saying to call 23 Wachovia Auto or something like that (definitely Wachovia and something 24 car related). I've never done any business with Wachovia and my car has 25 been paid off for a year. They called my cell phone with an autodialer, 26 pretty sure that's illegal." 27 28

Available at, http://800notes.com/Phone.aspx/1-949-753-1322 (accessed on April 25, 2011).

- 24. The members of the Consent Class, Reference Class and Skip-Tracing Class share well defined and nearly identical questions of law and fact, which predominate over questions that may affect individual members of the Classes.

  These common questions of law and fact include:
  - a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,
    Defendant has placed any calls (other than a call made for emergency
    purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using
    any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice
    to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service.
  - b. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant has placed any calls to persons' cellular phones, where such persons do not have any debtor-creditor relationship with the Defendant (i.e., the recipient of Defendant's call is a reference, family member of the debtor or the like).
  - c. Whether Defendant maintained procedures and/or practices regarding calling persons because they are: (a) listed or otherwise used as a reference by a debtor, (b) a family member or other relative of the debtor, (c) the debtor's employer or co-worker, or (d) live with or near the debtor.
  - d. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,
    Defendant has placed any calls to any cellular phone numbers that
    Defendant obtained through the use of skip tracing.
  - e. Whether Defendant maintained procedures and/or practices regarding segregating telephone numbers obtained through skip tracing that are cellular telephone numbers to ensure that such numbers are not called using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice.
  - f. Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and/or willful.

- g. Whether Defendant can meet its burden of proving it had obtained prior express consent for such calls to members of the Classes.
- h. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from placing such calls in the future.
- 25. Members of the Classes are ascertainable and can be identified through Defendant's records. The contemplated notice to the Classes will be refined through discovery but is likely to include a combination of mail, email, publication, Internet notice and call centers.
- 26. Plaintiff and members of the Classes are entitled to statutory damages as provided for under the TCPA.
- 27. As a person that received numerous calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice: (1) without Plaintiff's prior express consent; (2) as a person who never had an account with Defendant; and (3) as a person who did not provide her cellular phone number to Defendant, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Classes.
- 28. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Consent Class, Reference Class and Skip-Tracing Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Classes.
- 29. Plaintiff and the members of the Classes have all suffered harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, members of the Classes will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal law.
- 30. Because of the size of the individual class member's claims, few, if any, class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

- 31. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the TCPA.
- 32. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.
- 33. Defendant has acted on grounds and refused to act on grounds generally applicable to each of the Classes.
- 34. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests certification of the Classes pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3). In the event that individual issues predominate or notice to any one of the Classes cannot be provided in accordance with the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B), Plaintiff respectfully requests that such class be certified pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2) for injunctive relief and that notice be delivered as directed by the Court under Rule 23(b)(2)(A).

#### FIRST CLAIM

## (NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA)

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 36. The forgoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitutes numerous negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 37. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff and each of the members of the Classes are entitled to statutory damages of \$500 for each and every Prohibited Call placed by Defendant, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 38. Plaintiff and the members of the Classes are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

# 

# 

# 

# 

## 

## 

# 

# 

## 

### 

### \_\_\_

# 

### 

# 

#### .

### 

### 

# 

### 

### 

#### 

#### SECOND CLAIM

### (KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA)

- 39. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 40. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitutes numerous knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 41. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C § 227, Plaintiff and each of the members of the Classes are entitled to treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 42. Plaintiff and the members of the Classes are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 43. Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff and the members of the Classes the following relief against Defendant:
  - a. An Order, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c) and (g), certifying the proposed Classes and appointing Plaintiff's undersigned counsel of record to represent the Consent Class, Reference Class and Skip-Tracing Class.
  - b. An Order issuing an injunction, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), enjoining Defendant from placing any further Prohibited Calls to members of the Classes and complying with the TCPA.
  - c. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each member of the Classes \$500 in statutory damages, for each Prohibited Call placed to members of the Classes, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

	·							
1	d. As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47							
2	U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each member of the							
3	Classes treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500 for each and							
4	every Prohibited Call placed by Defendant, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §							
5	227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).							
6.	e. An award of attorneys' fees and costs to counsel.							
7	f. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.							
8	TRIAL BY JURY							
9								
10	44. Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all claims.							
11	Dated: April 26, 2011 THE MATHEWS LAW GROUP							
12	By: Class. The							
13	Charles T. Mathews							
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff CLAUDIA JOHNSON							
15	CLAUDIA JOHNSOIN							
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
. 28								
	-12-							

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

THE MATHEWS LAW GROUP	
CHARLES T. MATHEWS (SBN 55889)	
GEORGE S. AZADIAN (SBN 253342)	•
2596 Mission Street, Suite 204	
San Marino, California 91108	·
	DISTRICT COURT T OF CALIFORNIA
CLAUDIA JOHNSON, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,	CASE NUMBER
Others shimarry studence,	CV 11-03590 PA (JCx)
PLAINTIFF(S)	
. v.	
WELLS FARGO DEALER SERVICES, INC.,	,
formerly known as WACHOVIA DEALER	
SERVICES, INC.	SUMIMONS
DEFENDANT(S).	
**************************************	OTDYKODO DIO
TO: DEFENDANT(S): WELLS FARGO DEALER	SERVICES, INC.
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, C 2596 Mission Street, Suite 204, San Marino, Californi	12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer HARLES T. MATHEWS , whose address is
·	
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
Dated: April 26, 2011	The state of the s
Dated: April 26, 2011	The Court of the C
Dated: April 26, 2011	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk
Dated: April 26, 2011	By: NANCY K BOEHME
Dated: April 26, 2011	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)
	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)  1191
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United St	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United St	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)  1191
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United St	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)  1191
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United St	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)  1191
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United St 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	By: NANCY K BOEHME  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)  1191

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CIVIL CO	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA VER SHEET									
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself []) Claudia Johnson	DEFENDANTS Wells Fargo Dealer Services, Inc. 23 Pasteur Irvine, California 92613									
(b) Attorneys (Finn Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing yourself, provide same.)  THE MATHEWS LAW GROUP	Attorneys (If Known)									
2596 Mission Street, Suite 204; San Marino CA 91108 626-683-8291										
(Place a	INSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only in X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.)									
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff □ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of The	of Business in this State									
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	of Business in Another State									
	ubject of a Foreign Country 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6									
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)    Solid     2   Removed from   3   Remanded from   4   Reinstated or   5   Transferred from another district (specify):   6   Multi-   7   Appeal to District   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1										
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: Yes IN O (Check.	Yes' only if demanded in complaint.)									
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes No	MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$ \$1500/violation (over \$5,000,000)									
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and 28 U.S.C. 1332(d)	write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)									
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)										
□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 110 Insurance □ HEERS@NALENV	以下の表現   10   10   10   10   10   10   10   1									
☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 330 Banks and Banking ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 315 Airplane Pr	oduct 370 Other Fraud Vacate Sentence 720 Labor/Mgmt,									
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending Habeas Corpus Relations									
□ 460 Deportation Overpayment & Slander	Property Damage   S35   Death Penalty   Reporting &									
☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcement of ☐ 330 Fed. Emolo	yers' □ 385 Property Damage □ 540 Mandamus/ Disclosure Act									
Organizations Old Marine	Product Liability Other   740 Railway Labor Act   550 Crvil Rights   790 Other Labor									
☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted ☐ 343 Marine Pro	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC □ 555 Prison Condition Litigation									
1490 Cable/Sat I V Stildent Loan (Excl. 1350 Motor Veh										
.   850 Securities/Commodities/   153 Recovery of Product Lie	USC 157 G610 Agriculture PROBERTYRIGETISE									
Exchange Overpayment of U 360 Other Pers	ability onal G41 Voting G20 Other Food & G20 Copyrights G41 Voting Drug G830 Patent									
USC 3410 🖂 160 Stockholders' Suits 🖂 362 Personal Ir	njury- 442 Employment 625 Drug Related 840 Trademark									
<ul> <li>         Ø 890 Other Statutory Actions         □ 190 Other Contract         □ Med Malp         □ 195 Contract Product         □ 365 Personal In         □ 365 Pe</li></ul>										
☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Liability Product Li	ability   444 Welfare 881   862 Black Lung (923)									
Act D 196 Franchise D 368 Asbestos F 1893 Environmental Matters Injury Pro										
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 210 Land Condemnation Liability	Employment   650 Airline Regs   864 SSID Title XVI									
□ 895 Freedom of Info: Act □ 220 Forcelosure □ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi- □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 462 Naturalization										
nation Under Equal 240 Torts to Land Application	on Cher 690 Other 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff									
□ 950 Constitutionality of □ 290 All Other Real Property Alien Det	ainee Rights 🗆 871 IRS-Third Party 26									
State Statutes   G 465 Other Imp Actions	USC 7609									
•										
CV 44 025	(00 DA (10-)									
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:	590 PA (JCx)									
AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.										

CIVIL COVER SHEET

. Page 1 of 2

CV-71 (05/08)

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

If yes, list case	number(s):			d dismissed, remanded or closed? 🗹 No 🗆 Yes	_
VIII(b). REL	ATED CASES: Have an number(s):	y cases been previo	usly filed in this court that	are related to the present case? VNo Ves	
(Check all box	□ B. Cal □ C. For □ D. Inv	ise from the same or ill for determination to other reasons would volve the same pater	closely related transactions of the same or substantially ld entail substantial duplicant, trademark or copyright, a	ns, happenings, or events; or y related or similar questions of law and fact; or ation of labor if heard by different judges; or and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.	
			, use an additional sheet if	•	
(a) List the C	County in this District; Cal	lifomia County outs gencies or employe	side of this District; State if ses is a named plaintiff. If t	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).	,
County in thi				California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country Texas	_
(b) List the (	County in this District; Ca	difornia County out	side of this District; State if	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).	
County in th				California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Orange Co	unty, California				
(c) List the	County in this District; Co	alifornia County our	tside of this District, State i	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. lved.	
County in the				California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Orange Co	unty, California			Texas	
* Los Angel	es, Orange, San Bernard	lino, Riverside, Ve	ntura, Santa Barbara, or tract Wand involved	San Luis Obispo Counties	
	URE OF ATTORNEY (C		Auly-	Date April 26, 2011	
Notice	to Counsel/Parties: The	e CV-71 (JS-44) Ci	ed by the Judicial Conferen	ormation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings are of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)	
Key to Stati	stical codes relating to So	cial Security Cases:	•		
	Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement	of Cause of Action	
	861	HIA	All claims for health inst Also, include claims by l program. (42 U.S.C. 193	surance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended, hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the 35FF(b))	
	862	BL	All claims for "Black Lu (30 U.S.C. 923)	ung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.	
	863 DIWC All claims filed by i amended; plus all cl			red workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as as filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))	
	863	DIWW	Act, as amended. (42 U		
	864	SSID	Act, as amended.	ental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Secur	
•	865	RSI	All claims for retiremer U.S.C. (g))	nt (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42	
				·	

CIVIL COVER SHEET

CV-71 (05/08)

Page 2 of 2